

CMER
December 18, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees:

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Godbout, Kevin	Weyerhaeuser
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Keller, Steve	NOAA Fisheries
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC, CMER Staff
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC, CMER Staff
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Environmental Consultants
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW, CMER co-chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farm
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Stringer, Angela	Campbell Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Decisions and Tasks

Decisions and Tasks	Minutes Section
CMER Meetings will be held on the third Tuesday of each month	Minutes
McDonald agreed to work with Schuett-Hames to provide an outline of the SRC review process for CMER's consideration at their January meeting.	SRC Update

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISAG: CMER approved the Validation Study Design Report to move forward to SRC review with a requirement for open review. • ISAG: CMER approved the use of no more than \$2,000 in project development funds to develop maps illustrating how the watertyping model will work on-the-ground. 	SAG Requests
DNR requested a list of CMER research plots on state lands to help them better plan management activities on their lands without damaging CMER research plots. Industrial landowners would like the same type of information. Quinn and Martin agreed to work with McFadden and Schuett-Hames to develop a plan for how CMER could provide this information.	DNR Research Plots
Type N Experimental study design will be the science topic at the January CMER meeting	January Science Session
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WETSAG: CMER approved a \$20,000 addition to the budget for a new study design/literature project for WETSAG • LWAG: CMER approved a \$20,000 addition to the ongoing Tailed Frog Meta Analysis for data collation and input tasks. 	Afternoon Session

Minutes: October and November CMER minutes were approved as amended.

CMER 2004 meeting schedule: CMER meetings will be on the third Tuesday of each month. (schedule attached).

SRC Update: Two bull trout reports have been received back from the SRC. The DFC report was submitted earlier this week with a cover letter. The ISAG fish model validation report will be forwarded soon. Fransen added that ISAG will be forwarding an additional question from Chris Mendoza regarding the Fish Model Report with an accompanying response from the Statistics Group, to the SRC for consideration during their review. Martin suggested that as reviews come back in from the SRC, they should be forwarded directly to the authors and reviewed concurrently by SAGs.

McNaughton added that the University is also committed to the double-blind review process. Therefore, author's names should be removed from reports before they are submitted to the SRC. Quinn indicated that there will be some cases where we will ask

for open reviews. In these cases, we will need to find individuals who are willing to participate in open reviews.

McDonald distributed an illustration of how he sees the SRC process operating. Schuett-Hames indicated that this illustration captures only one type of SRC review – the double-blind. There may be other processes that we use for open reviews which should also be illustrated. Schuett-Hames suggested that an alternative approach be outlined as well. Schuett-Hames said that maybe we would have a step geared toward handling study designs – a lot more back and forth communication would be involved in the more open review process. Jackson asked how we handle courses of action as a result of the review. All other comments should be directed to Dennis McDonald. He will incorporate those and bring a proposed process to CMER for consideration at the January meeting. (dennis.mcdonald@wadnr.gov). It was also suggested that the group drafting the Protocols and Standards Manual, re-draft the sections related to SRC review to reflect these changes.

Martin suggested that CMER participants read Federal Register, Volume 16, No. 178, Monday, September 15, 2003. This text represents a proposal for scientific review and talks about interactions between reviewers and authors and what types of information should be shared.

SAG Requests:

- LWAG: the meta-analysis data set on tailed frogs needs some work to make all the data sets compatible with one another. LWAG's request is for \$20,000 to work on the datasets. McNaughton asked whether this can wait until February 10, 2004 when we bring the full budget to the FPB. MacCracken indicated that they could wait for funding until February 2004. A final decision on this request was made at the afternoon CMER session.
- Wetland Literature Review: WETSAG requested \$20,000 to continue the contract for the literature review. SRC and CMER commented and as a result, substantial edits were suggested. WETSAG would like to contract these changes out to the same contractor for incorporation into the literature review. Discussions regarding whether or not the contractor should receive additional funding to incorporate these changes ensued. Mendoza commented that the LWAG request, the WETSAG request and the ISAG request from last month are all contract management issues. CMER should work on a process to ensure that in the future, the process for contract management is improved. A final decision on the WETSAG request was made at the afternoon CMER session.
- ISAG 1: ISAG recommended that the Validation Study Design Report move forward to SRC review. ISAG will continue with some QA/QC on the study report. Quinn suggested an open review process for this document so that ISAG can discuss the QA/QC changes they will be making to the document.
CMER Consensus: the study design report will proceed to SRC review with an open

review process required and it will be noted in the cover letter that the QA/QC plan design is now under development. CMER is in consensus that the QA/QC plan is necessary. CMER also requested that the budget implications of this open review process agreement be explored by ISAG and recommendations brought to CMER at the January meeting.

- **ISAG 2:** Fransen said that the Policy group asked for some maps that will illustrate how the model works and how it compares to the interim rule. These will be used for presentations to communicate how this is working on the ground. Policy has not submitted a written request at this time but would like the maps developed. Therefore, ISAG is requesting approximately \$1,000 in project development funds to pay for these maps.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved the use of no more than \$2,000 in project development funds to develop the maps.

Policy Update: Quinn said that there was a Policy meeting on December 4th. The discussions focused on PIP studies - the issue facing them is what does this mean relative to a rule change. There were a range of opinions expressed at the meeting. It was ultimately decided that Policy needs to be involved in CMER research products much earlier in the process. Martin, McNaughton, Quinn and Smitch met to discuss this and a process will be developed to assure that, in the future, Policy is better prepared to receive results of CMER studies. In the future, when CMER designs studies, they will need to carefully consider what information will result from the study and share that information with the Policy Committee.

Smitch added that the problem confronting CMER and the FFR process is that the ground rule states that the agreement will go where the science takes it. The PIP study made Policy realize that some of this could have profound impacts on the way the prescriptions are set up. How policy deals with this information is important. Policy needs to be involved in the questions being asked and answered by CMER and need to understand the implications before the studies are completed.

Rowe suggested that the process be designed around a full study – such as DFC – rather than designed around a pilot study. Schuett-Hames said that, looking back on how this evolved, policy engaged CMER in dialogue surrounding Schedule L-1 to develop the program. The program has now evolved. The problem is that when L-1 was transferred to CMER, the dialogue with policy stopped. CMER and Policy need continual dialogue. CMER needs something more than just the workplan to communicate with policy about studies and what may come out of them. McConnell stated concern with too much hands-on involvement from policy.

Smitch said that CMER's information will go into changing public policy and will directly affect it. Protecting the scientific integrity while considering policy implications is important.

Workplan Update: Schuett-Hames said that the workplan has been updated thanks to contributions of SAGs. The strategy sections have also been improved and better documented. Direct linkages to projects are now clearer. There are also improvements in project descriptions. The main gap at this time is project descriptions for eastside type F riparian prescription validation studies. SAGE is having productive discussions about this, but would like more time to work on it.

Schedule:

The workplan will be forwarded to CMER and Policy within the week. A cover letter will accompany the plan and will include information about the approval schedule for both the budget and the workplan. A schedule is as follows:

December 26 - Workplan to CMER and Policy with cover letter. Deadline for comments is January 13th. If there are substantive comments, CMER will recirculate the workplan for review prior to the January 20th meeting and with a list of decision points based on comments received.

January 20th - CMER Committee meets, proposed 04 work plan and budget finalized

Week of 1/26 – FFR Policy meets to discuss 04 workplan and budget

February 10th - FPB meets to approve 04 workplan and budget

DNR Research Plots: McFadden said that Richard Bigley from DNR State Lands put in a request for a list of CMER research plots on DNR lands, a description of what the plots look like, the status of the plot, and who the DNR contact person was that approved the plot use. McFadden asked that CMER participants get that information to him ASAP so he can compile it and send it on. Private landowners would like the same type of information. Schuett-Hames said that this issue brings up again how CMER wants to deal with project information over time.

Quinn and Martin will meet with Schuett-Hames and McFadden to develop a plan and will bring a proposal back to CMER.

CMER Science Conference: Martin said that CMER participants should have received a list of talks scheduled for the February 2004 Adaptive Management Science Conference. There will be one additional talk scheduled relating to bull trout. There will be one more announcement in mid-January, which will include detailed logistical information.

SAG Issues

- ISAG - The final eastside field survey data report will be brought to CMER in January for approval. It has been through SRC review and comments have been addressed.
- UPSAG - The Roads sub-basin effectiveness monitoring plan is being revised and will be redistributed to CMER in the next few weeks for additional comments.

- Pleus said that CMER should begin selecting people and requiring them to review studies rather than relying on volunteers.
 - RSAG is working on extensive monitoring for riparian prescriptions. They are working with UPSAG on this and a draft will be coming forward in 2004.
 - SAGE is working on designing their program and is optimistic that a plan will be coming forward soon.
-

January Science Session: Type N Experimental study design discussion.

Feasibility Studies/Pilot Studies: the bull trout overlay and hardwood conversion studies were approved by the FPB to proceed on December 2nd, 2003. Quinn asked McNaughton to provide a memo to CMER explaining the approval and outlining any requirements.

Afternoon Decisions

- 1) CMER approved a \$20,000 addition to the budget for a new Study Design/Literature Project for WETSAG. The purpose of this project is to focus information needs and to define study designs for the Forest Regeneration and Wetland Mitigation Studies. These funds are a place-holder for this proposed project. Final approval is pending CMER review of an expected study plan from WETSAG.
- 2) CMER approved a \$20,000 addition to the ongoing Tailed Frog Meta Analysis. This addition is needed for data collation and data input tasks.